

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15, and 16 are all the claims pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-3 and 8-10 have been allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0025077 to DE HAAN *et al.* (“Haan”). For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants submit that claim 15 is not anticipated by Haan. For example, claim 15 relates to a video decoding method. The video decoding method comprises, *inter alia*, determining, by a decoder, whether to perform motion compensation on motion-vector-decoded data or not depending on a value of a decoded motion vector. Based on a result of the determining whether to perform the motion compensation, a decoded image is generated.

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Haan discloses each and every one of the above-noted features of claim 15. Specifically, it is asserted that Haan’s FIGS. 3 and 4 along with paragraphs [0058]-[0059] disclose the claimed determining step. We would respectfully disagree.

For instance, Haan discloses unconditionally motion-compensating the incoming image signal (only the source of the incoming motion vectors varies). On the other hand, as noted above, claim 15 recites *determining whether to perform motion compensation on motion-vector-*

decoded data or not depending on a value of a decoded motion vector. In other words, depending on the value of the decoded motion vector, a determination is made as to whether the motion compensation on motion-vector-decoded data *should even be performed*. No such determination is disclosed by Haan. Rather, motion compensation is always carried out in Haan.

Specifically, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Haan discloses that its motion compensation unit (MC unit, see FIG. 3) receives either motion vectors from the variable length decoder VLC⁻¹ or motion vectors from the motion estimator ME2 (Haan, paragraph [0059], and Office Action, page 3, lines 8-10). That is, Haan's MC unit carries out motion compensation on the image data (corresponding closest to the claimed motion-vector-decoded data) in all instances - only the source of the incoming motion vectors varies (i.e., either the VLC⁻¹ or the ME2). As such, Haan does not disclose *determining whether to perform motion compensation on motion-vector-decoded data or not depending on a value of a decoded motion vector* as recited by claim 15, since motion compensation is *always* performed in Haan.

For *at least* the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Haan cannot anticipate claim 15.

Moreover, claim 15 recites determining whether to perform motion compensation on motion-vector-decoded data or not depending on a value of a decoded motion vector. On the other hand, Haan discloses that its switch 19 (which is used to control what source of the incoming motion vectors is used, see FIG. 3) is controlled by the I/P control signal. This I/P control signal does not disclose or even remotely suggest a value of a decoded motion vector, as claimed. Accordingly, Haan does not disclose or suggest determining whether to perform

motion compensation on motion-vector-decoded data depending on value of the decoded motion vector, as recited by claim 15. Accordingly, Haan cannot anticipate claim 15.

Claim 16 recites a motion vector determiner *determining whether to perform motion compensation or not depending on a value of a decoded motion vector*. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable for *at least* reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 15.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. McKenna
by / S. Stuart Lee /

S. Stuart Lee
Registration No. 61,124

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 19, 2009